



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## EDITORIAL NOTES

### **Facts About Our Organization.**

From questions which are submitted to us from time to time by a number of our field workers, we assume that it will be of interest for us to state in other words some of the facts concerning our national organization under the terms of the Revised Constitution adopted by the American Peace Society in May, 1916.

Under this constitution it is proposed that the Divisions shall take the place of the State societies existing heretofore. These Divisions will operate as the American Peace Society. They will therefore not be "autonomous" in the old sense. They will promote the work of the American Peace Society in accordance with the new constitution and subject to the approval of the National Board of Directors.

The scale of membership fees within the Divisions shall, unless otherwise provided by the National Board of Directors, be the scale provided in Article 3 of the new constitution. The Divisions will pay annually to the National Office the sum of fifty cents for each annual member. This fifty cents is to apply to the cost of printing the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. The whole question of membership fees, other than annual members and the payment of the fifty cents for the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, remains open. This is a problem which requires time and study to solve. At present each case is being decided upon its own merits. Its ultimate solution remains as one of the tasks for the Board of Directors, upon which each Division will of course be proportionately represented.

It is not expected that the Divisions will wish to enter into relations of affiliation and co-operation with other groups and organizations, contrary to the wishes of the National Board of Directors. Naturally the main office will wish to operate through its Departments, and thence on through the Divisions to the Sections and members. There are as yet no by-laws governing this situation, however, and the details of this arrangement may necessitate some rearrangement in certain quarters.

The object of this reorganization of the American Peace Society, unanimously adopted at its annual meeting in May, is to promote co-ordinated effort and efficiency. The desirability for such effort is neither debated nor debatable.

Already the following organizations have officially accepted the plan: Connecticut, Vermont, Chicago, Maryland, Southern States, Washington, D. C., Nebraska, Minnesota, and the Pacific coast. A number of other acceptances can be reported soon.

### **The Zollvereins Planning More War.**

The Allies are planning a customs union, or Zollverein, of unprecedented proportion. During an indefinite period following the peace, it is proposed to subject the commerce of their enemies "either to prohibition or to a special system that shall be efficacious." They propose to omit "the most favored nation clause" of the old commercial treaties, and all of the nine Allies are openly to give each other preference in their reciprocal trade. The present war in no insignificant sense grew out of Germany's complaint of discrimination against her. The Allies denied this discrimination. But now the Allies are starting out on a discrimination, open, all their own, and dangerous. Germany and the other Central Powers will, of course, complain. If the plans of the Zollverein are matured and enforced, the basis for the complaint cannot again be denied. In any event, the capitalists of the Allies are paving the way for commercial hatreds sure to breed war. It will simply be Zollverein against Zollverein, and then armies against armies.

### **The United States Ridiculed Abroad?**

The United States is ridiculed abroad. If you don't believe it, ask the jingoes and junkers at home. Go to the politician, with his army and navy program, or to the frenzied press that sees no hope beyond the range of a sixteen-inch gun. Go further. Ask the crazed chancelleries of Europe, especially the dunderpated persons euphemistically called diplomats. You may expect an affirmation from any whose interest it is to punch democracy between the eyes with the blows of privilege. Go to the swashbuckler, with his lust of power and his gold braid of pride.

But if you are afraid to hear another story, keep away from the farmers, the miners, and the tradesmen who are bearing the brunt of the war in the trenches over there. Don't ask the mothers who are giving all they have, nor the real women anywhere. Avoid the prison camps as you investigate. Keep away from the wounded brought in peril from the field by American Red Cross drivers, tended by volunteer American nurses and surgeons. The United States ridiculed abroad! If you really wish to believe it, don't consult your own sense and conscience. Ask Mars.

Walking through the madhouse of the world, you think you hear laughter. Look more closely. Listen more attentively. Is it laughter? The maniacal ravings you hear are very disquieting to sensitive persons. But they are not laughter. You have read Mr. Shaw's *Androcles and the Lion*. You recall the group of Chris-

tians threatened by the Centurion's Guard before the city gate. You recall the merriment of the Christians. That was laughter—real laughter.

**“Hell a Mile High” in Mexico.**

What is the matter with Mexico becomes blindingly clear in the light of the various reports of the attitude of the American “interests” towards that country and people. We know no more striking example of this than the casual conversation reported by Badger Clark in a recent issue of *Survey*. This conversation was held seven years ago. It is none the less impressive, however, when we consider that such expressions of opinion have not lessened during these years, and especially when we reckon up the cumulative effect of them on the minds of other “confidential employees” whose interests prejudice them in favor of “intervention.” As we read:

“We own a good deal of that down there,” said my companion, waving his cigarette toward the south, “but we’ve got to have it under a government that will stand hitched.”

“We,” said I. “Who’s we?”

“Oh, I mean the System, the men that run this country.”

“Well, that would be up to the people,” said I, “and I don’t reckon the American people want to take over any more colored orphan asylums until they get rid of the Philippines.”

“The people don’t run this country, son,” replied my friend, in the tone of one addressing a little child. “They don’t now, and perhaps they never did. The System runs this country and the System wants Mexico. Uncle Porfirio is getting old, and any kind of greaser government is so uncertain that our dividends ain’t safe from one year to another, anyway. With the money we’ve got invested down there, we’ve simply got to have a stable government to do business under. One of these days we’ll take Mexico, or at least Sonora and Chihuahua.”

“And how?” said I.

“United States army, of course,” he said, still with patronizing gentleness.

“I always supposed the United States army worked for the United States Government,” said I, my perfectly good American blood beginning to simmer a little.

“Oh, they do, they do,” he smiled, “but it’s all as simple as four aces, just the same. Uncle Porfirio is getting shaky and his feet are loose in the stirrups. Mexico is due for a revolution in a year or two, even if he doesn’t die. If it doesn’t start on time, it can be started.”

“Well,” said I, “that just means another Mexican government.”

“Wait,” he answered. “That’s just revolution number one. There can be others. Give any enterprising pelado a dozen rifles and five thousand rounds and he’ll call himself a general and start out to save his country against all comers. It’s a heap easier than working at Mexican wages.”

“Well?” said I.

“Why, can’t you see?” said this loyal retainer of the System. “Mexico is full of American property and American citizens. In the general rookus that will be stirred up American properties will be looted. The owners in this country will start a holler. Then American citizens will be plugged, and perhaps some American women will get carried off, and then the holler will be a yell. You know what a sentimental, hysterical outfit the American people are. You ‘remember the *Maine*,’ don’t you? Well, Congress will have to come through. The President will have to come through. The army will waltz across the line. Mexicans fight better than they work, and they don’t love us two-bits’ worth, so it’s likely to be ‘hell a mile high’ for a while. It will cost the Government so much to get in that they won’t be in any hurry to get out again. When the dead are finally planted and the dust blows away, a good part of Mexico will be under American control for good and our dividends will be safe. Sabe?”

**The Russo-Japanese Horse-trade.**

Translated into terms of international peace, the treaty signed at Petrograd on July 3 by representatives of the Russian and Japanese governments bears a closer resemblance to an Oriental version of a David Harum horse-trade than anything we have seen for some time. Russia had a dark horse in the shape of about sixty miles of railroad extending from the Japanese line in Manchuria to a port on the Sungari River. This and the right to Japanese navigation on the river have long been coveted. Heretofore efforts to purchase this line have been unsuccessful. But the good horse-trader bides his time, as did Japan. Recently Russia stood in desperate need of guns and ammunition. None was to be had from the West and her own supply was hopelessly inadequate. Almost on the threshold, however, Japan’s arsenals were bursting with a more than adequate supply. And so the trading began. Japan, with Yankee shrewdness, at once sought the earth and sky for hidden dangers and despaired of letting go the precious provisions against national disaster. “Who would protect me then?” the Japanese murmured. “Who but I!” cried the Russian, and Japan hid its smile of triumph. These many years that country has sought to gain just that promise from Russia—a guarantee to come to the rescue in case of trouble with a third party over the Japanese policy in China. “But I must have a token of your good faith,” was the next play, and mention was made of some sixty miles of railroad. High stakes for Russia to pay, but none knew Russia’s need so well as her clever neighbor. And so the bargain was finally made and the pact signed, and throughout the island of Nippon good folk were bade rejoice at the love-feast.

It was a shrewd trade, and, as thorough Yankees ourselves, we should applaud mightily and accept becomingly the subtle flattery of imitation. But America is more concerned with international peace than with

clever horse-trading. We know too well that lasting affection and a kindly spirit are rarely bred in such a deal. Russia paid through the nose for the guns and shells she needed. When the shells have been fired and the guns are silent, Russia will not recall the affair with gratitude. Nor for all the well-staged rejoicing in Tokio will Japan bear greater love for her old-time foe because of the deal. Such alliances and treaties have little to do with international peace. The horse-trader is no pacifist.

#### **A Long Step Ahead.**

The policies of a nation are the expression of the principles of a people, and to say that a nation without definitely expressed foreign and domestic policies is to be regarded as unprincipled by other nations of the world is hardly to exaggerate. To a large extent this has been the anomalous position of the United States in the past. Its inconveniences, not to say perils, are many, but within the nation its most noticeable effect is to give strength to what Mr. H. G. Wells has so aptly called the "Gawdsakers." These are the people who rise excitedly in an emergency and shout aloud, "For God's sake, let's DO something!" When the *Lusitania* is sunk or our southern border raided, the shout becomes a shriek. The European war has made them purple-veined and breathless. To them the President spoke most pointedly when he declared, in Nebraska, speaking of our effort to maintain neutrality, "We are holding off, not because we do not feel concerned, but because when we exert the force of this nation we want to know what we are exerting it for."

This is not the declaration, perhaps, of an ardent pacifist, but it is a statement of a belief that can lead to none but a just war, if such a war exists. It is the expression of the need of national policies which shall adequately express the desire of this nation and this people to lead the world in honor, justice to its fellow-men of every nation, and integrity. And the expression of this need is the first long step in formulating such policies.

#### **The Broken Arguments.**

The arguments for war are of three kinds—biological, psychological, and moral. They have all been broken down by this war, as they have been broken down by every other war. The fit are not surviving in Europe. The law of the tooth and claw is more destructive of the best than ever before. Nothing in the whole history of the world since August 1, 1914, has demonstrated that war is either "natural" or "inevitable." The old doctrines, that "peace is a canker," that "war will be as long as men desire change," and as long as

some men "will to lead" and others "will to follow," are the empty phrases they always have been. That "war is a tonic" can be the belief of no one at the last.

War is the outgrowth of a lethargic society unwilling to reason and to act in the service of itself. Nations have been overcome by the thoughtless inactivities of the many and the irrational activities of the few. Shall the breakdown of these old false theories end in a more rational behavior after the war? "Practical men" are turning more and more toward some form of a life-saving and life-serving international co-operative organization. Baron Sakatani brought to us the other day the word that every responsible leader of Europe hopes for such organization. We know this to be true of Premier Asquith, Lord Grey, and Mr. Balfour. Viscount Bryce recently re-emphasized the importance of it in a notable address in Birmingham. The arts and the sciences, education and religion, politics and the hopes of humanity, are at stake. This is why. Here and there men are trying to discover the world as it is, and to begin all over to draw things as they see them "for the God of things as they are." The old arguments led only to the pit. Shall we begin something new, or are our brains inadequate for such a task? The old civilization was "putty, brass, an' paint." Any new civilization will evolve out of ideas and ideals. Are we big enough for the ideas? Can we get up muscle enough to create our ideals into something concrete?

#### **But She Ain't.**

"Well," says our friend the cynic, "what's the use of running a peace shop in the midst of a war like this?"

You see what it comes to! Humans are humans; they fight." That the last century has seen a steady and ever-widening growth of the hope for peace in the world, and that that century ends in the greatest and most devastating war in all history, is a serious matter. Must we indeed close up our peace shop and go hunting Utopia elsewhere in the universe? It is best to consult an authority in the matter. Kipling, for instance:

"If England was what England seems,  
An' not the England of our dreams,  
But only putty, brass an' paint,  
'Ow quick we'd chuck 'er!  
But she ain't!"

"But she ain't" is the brave line. It rings with the spirit of the pacifist. The pacifist is very clear in his own mind about the whole course before him. Nothing in the last three years has dimmed his vision. The old Machiavellian days produced the inevitable explosion. In consequence our international color blindness is clearing up. The world is not what the world seems, just noise, and greed, and insanity. As the pacifist views

this same old world, he has no desire to "chuck 'er." He believes that the old things are passing away. He is encouraged that kings and lords, ministers and generals, candidates for office and the man next door are all pleading for a means of overcoming war. He lends his devotion to the world that lies back of the "putty, brass, an' paint."

**"The Only Way."**

The New York *Times* is quite of the opinion that the new battle cruisers for the United States Navy are an investment to secure international peace. These floating forts are to be 850 feet long, and with a speed of from thirty-two to thirty-five knots. Their displacement will be 35,000 tons, as against the English warships of the "Queen Elizabeth" type, with only 27,500 tons. Each of these new swift-going war machines will carry ten fourteen-inch guns. The \$20,000,000 machines will, in short, represent the superlative in dimensions and speed. This New York paper grants that "economically the loss of one of these powerful cruisers will be very serious; but ships are not built to be lost. The one thing certain is that with plenty of cruisers of this type ready for action and the newer 32,000-ton dreadnaughts in commission, the chance of the United States Navy being dragged into war will be remote. We are building for defense, not for offense. . . . That is the only way to do it." Of course Germany has presented this kind of an argument for forty years; so has Great Britain, France, and Japan. The pathetic side of the matter is that the *Times* probably sincerely believes what it says to be true. It picks out what is demonstrably the most hopeless way possible of keeping the peace, and gravely asserts it to be "the only way to do it." It the *Times* has its way, this type of reasoning in a circle will go on and on until the next war follows, as the night follows the day, and when it comes we'll be in it.

**"Viva Mexico."**

Either Mexico is a nation, with a patriotic conception of nationality, a fervent desire to establish that nation in its integrity before the world, or it is no more than a nameless group of individuals, destined inevitably to be absorbed within other boundaries and to pass forgotten from the map of the world. The United States, thus far in its dealings with the Carranza government, has acted upon the belief that Mexico is a nation. We have presumed the Mexican government to be honestly attempting, under nearly overwhelming difficulties, but with utmost patriotism, to establish, as we established not so many years ago, a more stable nationality. In this belief we have patiently extricated ourselves from many vexatious entanglements with her and are at pres-

ent, at Atlantic City, endeavoring, through our representatives to the joint conference, to anticipate and avoid similar entanglements in the future and to lend the assistance of an older and more experienced government to this perilously burdened people.

In this we are makers of history, pioneers in one of the finest demonstrations of the brotherhood of nations that history can record. We have suffered stinging losses, "insults" (as we have at times been pleased to call them), aggravations innumerable, which might with some semblance of justice have been laid to this attempt in Mexico to win a wider and more substantial freedom. Yet we are strong enough and great enough to look beyond these vexations and voluntarily to lend our efforts to the establishment of the new Mexico. It is well for us to realize the true greatness of what we are doing; to appraise at its true value this priceless gift that we are conferring, even though it be at the cost of American money and American lives. We may be properly proud of our endeavor. We may look upon ourselves as builders and creators, and in a world at present given over to destruction. We have built a Panama Canal; we have stood four-square for the rights of neutrals. We can do more. We can establish a new standard of responsibility of a greater nation for a weaker. We can create new and higher values in international relations. We are doing this today.

**Applying Peace Platforms in the Pacific.**

Do these words, spoken by Senator Borah, indeed relate a "fact"?

"I have become thoroughly convinced that the American people as a people, regardless of party and party pledges, are in favor of holding the Philippine Islands. I rise to impress on the Filipino people the lesson which I gathered, and that is, that they should adjust themselves to the fact that they are a part of the United States, and will remain so permanently."

We are beginning to picture the United States as taking a lead in the making of peace in Europe and in perfecting an international system that will end wars. In our platforms we are specifying that "no annexation or transfer of territory shall be made contrary to the interests and wishes of the population concerned." The inconsistency between this statement and such as that quoted above is too evident. Granted that we do the Filipinos only a kindness by withdrawing our power slowly from the islands, as they give good evidence of their ability to govern themselves: the fact remains that they are a people, with a conception, however clouded, of nationality, and that recognition on our part of the right of distinct peoples to be governed only by their own consent cannot well be extended across one ocean and withdrawn from the other.

We would urge, then, that we visualize ourselves clearly as the trustees of the Philippines, and no more. With this clear definition of our policy, we shall run less danger of confusing our aims and gradually usurping rights that are inconsistent with our professed beliefs.

No Senator will then "gather lessons" that we may blush to read. It is well to remember that in the Islands they quote with significant frequency Rizal's words: "The chains of another are irksome, even the golden."

## "ESTIMATE OF THE SITUATION"

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Secretary of the American Peace Society

### THE PROBLEM.

THE real problem facing the United States today is not so much a question of whether we shall or shall not add a mule driver, two blacksmiths, and a sergeant to our army, or a hundred submarines and numberless air-craft to our navy; it is not the question of this or that type of military organization; it is not even the question of "Prussianism," whatever that means, of imperialism, of militarism, of pro-German or of pro-Ally. The problem facing the United States, and so closely as not clearly to be seen, is, how are we going to perform our share toward overcoming the international war of forty years hence? How are we to avoid the race for the abyss, the fulfillment of Gambetta's prophecy when each nation shall be left "a beggar crouching by a barracks door"?

It is no mere figure of speech that civilization is or soon will be at the parting of the ways. Why we are not thinking and talking more about this is one of the paradoxes of American politics, for war is not inevitable any more than slavery, witchcraft, and the inquisition were inevitable.

It seems necessary for us to remind ourselves more frequently of this and of the fact that war as a means of settling international disputes, is and always has been unqualifiedly condemned by soldier and by civilian. Carl Schurz, a soldier of importance, expressed great indignation at the "flippant talk of war." The Duke of Wellington considered it a "detestable thing," and added, "If you had seen but one day of war you would pray God never to see another." General Sheridan held that "war will eliminate itself," and General Sherman that the glory of war is "all moonshine." Washington called it the "plague to mankind," and even Napoleon Bonaparte, at St. Helena, expressed the belief that "brute force can create nothing durable." Emerson called war "an epidemic of insanity;" Jefferson "the greatest of human evils," while Franklin repeatedly wrote: "There never was a good war nor a bad peace." William Ladd, founder of the American Peace Society, said, shortly before his death in 1841:

"Oh, that I had another life to devote to the holy cause of peace. It is a cause to die for. It is to me the field of glory, the field on which my Saviour died."

It is written, and it is true not because it is written, but it is written because it is true:

"The Lord loveth justice. . . . And the work of righteousness shall be peace. . . . And God shall judge between the nations and arbitrate for many peo-

ples. . . . He shall make their officers peace, and their rulers righteousness."

Within a year, concluding an address before the House of Lords, Lord Courtney expressed himself in these eloquent words:

"We have been much moved of late by the history of a woman whose name would add luster to the great roll of noble English women. Miss Cavell's life was occupied in the service and sacrifice of love. A law-breaker, she came under the penalty of the law, and a barbarous and besotted government insisted on exacting the full penalty. In the many weeks she was in prison great thoughts took shape in Miss Cavell's mind, and her last words were: 'Standing before God and eternity, I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must be free from hate and bitterness.' With reverence I should like to make those words my own, and I beg your lordships to accept them in their simplicity and fullness."

With nearly three-fourths of the world at war, spending every week for purposes of wild destruction more than is spent in the entire United States in one whole year for peaceful education, it is of some importance that every intelligent person should realize that the one great problem facing civilization is the problem of making less possible a repetition of this irrational behavior. The militarists have a phrase that describes their procedure when confronted with a military problem. They first make an "estimate of the situation." I venture in this paper a brief "estimate of the situation."

### SOME FACTORS.

To solve the war problem is manifestly not easy. The economic rivalries, restrictions, and conflicts of interest are complicated facts. There is the continuous grasp for markets; there is the constant conflict between those who are beneficiaries of a predatory wealth and those who are upbuilding creative wealth. The irritations of competition are complicated by tariffs created by self-exploiting nations with little or no regard for the conditions or temper of other nations. These highly complicated economic facts, far from clearly understood, generate international fears and differences which often hasten the oncoming of war.

In addition to these economic factors, we are confronted with certain political situations and ambitions. There are the intolerant and the unnecessary differences and animosities between militarists and civilists, as if one large section of every nation madly desires war, while the remaining section as madly opposes it. Many